

Bose-Einstein Condensate: a Superposition of Macroscopically Squeezed States

Patrick Navez^{*†}

Institut für Physik, Universität Potsdam, Am Neuen Palais 10, D-14469 Potsdam, Germany
(February 1, 2008)

We study the ground state of a uniform Bose gas at zero temperature in the Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) approximation. We find a solution of the HFB equations which obeys the Hugenholtz-Pines theorem. This solution imposes a macroscopic squeezing to the condensed state and as a consequence displays large particle number fluctuations. Particle number conservation is restored by building the appropriate $U(1)$ invariant ground state via the superposition of the squeezed states. The condensed particle number distribution of this new ground state is calculated as well as its fluctuations which present a normal behavior.

PACS number(s): 03.75.Fi, 05.30.Jp, 42.50.Dv, 67.40.Db

Since the recent observation of Bose-Einstein condensation in dilute gas of trapped atoms [1], the theoretical developments of dilute Bose gas have regained a considerable interest. Among all these developments, the mean field Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov (HFB) approach provides a framework which allows to describe the properties of a dilute condensate in any regime of temperature [2–5]. But, according to previous works [2,3], the excitation spectrum in the approximate HFB approach is not gapless in the limit of a large particle Bose gas since it does not fulfill the Hugenholtz-Pines (HP) theorem. At least one supplementary approximation should be made in order to satisfy this theorem. Among those there are the "Bogoliubov" approximation [6,7] valid at zero temperature and the "Popov" approximation valid at finite temperature [8]. On the other hand, both these approximations have the disadvantage that, contrary to the HFB one, they cannot be deduced from a variational principle. As a consequence, there is no stationary ground state in both these approximations but a ground state which exhibits a quantum phase diffusion [9].

In this Letter, we propose to reconsider the variational HFB approach by investigating another kind of ground state solution both satisfying the HFB equations and the HP theorem. Solution which differs from those discussed previously [2,3] can indeed be found if we admit that the mean value of the two atoms amplitude $\langle \hat{\psi}_0 \hat{\psi}_0 \rangle$ of the condensed part field operator $\hat{\psi}_0$ is macroscopically dif-

ferent from the mean value of the atoms number $\langle \hat{\psi}_0^\dagger \hat{\psi}_0 \rangle$. This is possible if the condensed part state is macroscopically squeezed in the same way as we squeezed photons states in quantum optics [10].

Another complication with the HFB approach is the assumption that the $U(1)$ symmetry of the ground state is broken [11]. Thus, we have to face the problem of dealing with states of indefinite particle number but instead having a well defined phase. These states are certainly not physical since in any experiment the Bose gas should conserve its total particle number. This problem is important since the macroscopically squeezed ground state we propose suffers from prohibitively large particle number fluctuations. We solve the inconvenience by taking as a better ground state an adequate superposition of squeezed states with a fixed particle number [6].

The effective many body Hamiltonian of the uniform Bose gas is given by ($\hbar = 1$):

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{\vec{k}^2}{2m} \hat{c}_{\vec{k}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\vec{k}} + \frac{1}{2V} \sum_{\vec{k}, \vec{k}', \vec{q}} \mathcal{V}_{\vec{q}} \hat{c}_{\vec{k}+\vec{q}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\vec{k}'-\vec{q}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\vec{k}} \hat{c}_{\vec{k}'} \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{c}_{\vec{k}}^\dagger$ ($\hat{c}_{\vec{k}}$) is the annihilation (creation) operator expressed in the $\vec{k}$ momentum space with periodic boundary conditions ($\hat{\psi}(\vec{r}) = \sum_{\vec{k}} \exp(i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{r}) \hat{c}_{\vec{k}} / \sqrt{V}$), m is the atomic mass, $\mathcal{V}_{\vec{q}} = \int d\vec{r} \mathcal{V}(\vec{r}) \exp(-i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{r})$ are the Fourier components of the effective interaction pseudopotential $\mathcal{V}(\vec{r}) = (4\pi a/m) \delta^3(\vec{r}) (\partial/\partial r)r$, and a is the scattering length [6,7].

The HFB ansatz for a homogeneous gas is [5]:

$$|\theta\rangle_g = \hat{D}^\dagger \hat{S}^\dagger |0\rangle \quad (2)$$

$$\hat{D}^\dagger = \exp[N_c^{1/2} (e^{i\theta} \hat{c}_0^\dagger - e^{-i\theta} \hat{c}_0)] \quad (3)$$

$$\hat{S}^\dagger = \exp[\sum_{\vec{k}} s_{\vec{k}} (e^{2i\theta} \hat{c}_{\vec{k}-\vec{k}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{-\vec{k}}^\dagger - e^{-2i\theta} \hat{c}_{\vec{k}} \hat{c}_{-\vec{k}})/2] \quad (4)$$

$\hat{D}^\dagger$ is the unitary displacement operator generating a coherent state in the zero momentum mode with a mean number N_c . It has the property:

$$\hat{D} \hat{c}_0 \hat{D}^\dagger = \hat{c}_0 + e^{i\theta} N_c^{1/2} \quad (5)$$

$\hat{S}^\dagger$ is the unitary squeezing operator and creates particles in pairs $\hat{c}_{\vec{k}-\vec{k}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{-\vec{k}}^\dagger$ [6,10]. Parameters controlling the population of pairs are denoted $s_{\vec{k}}$ while θ is an arbitrary phase factor. This operator has the Bogoliubov transformation property:

^{*}Also: Institute of Materials Science, Demokritos N.C.S.R., POB 60228, 15310 Athens, Greece

[†]Email: Patrick.Navez@quantum.physik.uni-potsdam.de

$$\hat{S}\hat{c}_{\vec{k}}\hat{S}^\dagger = \cosh(s_{\vec{k}})\hat{c}_{\vec{k}} + \sinh(s_{\vec{k}})e^{2i\theta}\hat{c}_{-\vec{k}}^\dagger \quad (6)$$

The mean particle number is given by the average value $\langle \hat{N} \rangle$ of $\hat{N} = \sum_{\vec{k}} \hat{c}_{\vec{k}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\vec{k}}$ where we denote $\langle \hat{A} \rangle = {}_g \langle \theta | \hat{A} | \theta \rangle_g$. Using the transformations properties (5) and (6) and the unitary properties $\hat{D}\hat{D}^\dagger = \hat{1}$ and $\hat{S}\hat{S}^\dagger = \hat{1}$, we get after a normal ordering of the operators $N = \langle \hat{N} \rangle = \sum_{\vec{k}} N_{\vec{k}}$, $N_{\vec{k}} = \delta_{\vec{k},\vec{0}} N_c + (\cosh(2s_{\vec{k}}) - 1)/2$. Similarly, we get the following expression for the ground state energy [5]:

$$E_g = \langle \hat{H} \rangle = \sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{\vec{k}^2}{2m} N_{\vec{k}} + \frac{2\pi a}{mV} (N^2 - 2N_c^2) + \frac{2\pi a}{mV} \sum'_{\vec{k}, \vec{k}'} (N_{\vec{k}} N_{\vec{k}'} + M_{\vec{k}} M_{\vec{k}'}) \quad (7)$$

where $M_{\vec{k}} = \delta_{\vec{k},\vec{0}} N_c + \sinh(2s_{\vec{k}})/2$ and where the prime in the sum remind us the effect of the operator $(\partial/\partial r)r$ in the pseudopotential to remove ultraviolet divergences [6]. Minimizing the grand canonical Hamiltonian $\langle \hat{H} - \mu \hat{N} \rangle$ where μ is the chemical potential, we obtain the HFB equations [3,5] which can be rewritten as the closed set of equations:

$$\sinh(2s_{\vec{k}}) = - \frac{\Sigma_{12}}{\sqrt{(\vec{k}^2/2m - \mu + \Sigma_{11})^2 - \Sigma_{12}^2}} \quad (8)$$

$$\mu = \Sigma_{11} + \Sigma_{12} - \frac{8\pi a}{m} n_c \quad (9)$$

where we have introduced the normal and anomalous self-energies respectively [2,3,12]:

$$\Sigma_{11} = \frac{8\pi a}{m} n \quad (10)$$

$$\Sigma_{12} = \Sigma_{11} - \mu + \frac{8\pi a}{V} \left(\sum_{\vec{k}} \frac{\sinh(2s_{\vec{k}})}{2m} + \sum_{\vec{k} \neq 0} \frac{\Sigma_{12}}{\vec{k}^2} \right) \quad (11)$$

Here, $n = N/V$ is the particle density and $n_c = N_c/V$ is the coherent particle density.

The longwavelength excited states are given by $|\theta\rangle_{e,\vec{k}} = \hat{D}^\dagger \hat{S}^\dagger e^{i\theta} \hat{c}_{\vec{k}}^\dagger |0\rangle$ from which we can estimate using (8-11) the longwavelength excitation spectrum ${}_{e,\vec{k}} \langle \theta | \hat{H} | \theta \rangle_{e,\vec{k}} - E_g \sim [(\vec{k}^2/2m - \mu + \Sigma_{11})^2 - \Sigma_{12}^2]^{1/2}$. In the particular HFB framework, the Hugenholtz-Pines (HP) theorem states that $\mu = \Sigma_{11} - \Sigma_{12}$ [2,3] which is precisely the condition to have a gapless theory i.e. a theory in which there is no gap of energy between the ground state and the longwavelength excited states. In that case, the excitation spectrum corresponds to a phonon excitation of momentum $\vec{k}$ with a velocity $v = \sqrt{4\pi a n_c/m^2}$. An inspection of (11) shows that the HP theorem requires the term in parentheses of (11) to be either neglected as done in the Bogoliubov and Popov approximation schemes [8] or either equal to zero.

The essential point of this paper is that the term in parentheses of (11) can be exactly zero if we macroscopically squeeze the condensed part state.

Indeed, we take for the parameter $s_{\vec{0}}$ a negative huge value in such a way that $n_s = N_s/V = (\cosh(2s_{\vec{0}}) - 1)/(2V)$ is a finite quantity different from zero in the thermodynamic limit [13]. Since by (8) we have also the singular expression $\cosh^2(2s_{\vec{0}}) = 1/[1 - \Sigma_{12}^2/(\Sigma_{11} - \mu)^2]$, the existence of a macroscopic parameter N_s respects automatically the HP theorem in the thermodynamic limit [14]. Thus, defining $\hat{N}_0 = \hat{c}_{\vec{0}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\vec{0}}$, the condensed fraction density $n_0 = \langle \hat{N}_0 \rangle/V$ is not n_c but the sum $n_0 = n_c + n_s$ and $\sinh(2s_{\vec{0}})/2 = -[n_s + 1/(2V)]\Sigma_{12}/(\Sigma_{11} - \mu) \simeq -n_s$. The density n_s is still an arbitrary parameter and must be adjusted to verify the HP relation in (11). Removing the zero momentum mode, we can replace the sum $\sum_{\vec{k} \neq 0}$ by the integral $\frac{V}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3\vec{k}$ in Eq.(11). The integral can be easily carried out and gives, with the help of the HP relation and the Eq.(9), the result $n_s = 8(a^3 n_c/\pi)^{1/2} n_c$.

Similarly defining $\hat{N}_e = \hat{N} - \hat{N}_0$, the same replacement as above gives for the density of non-zero momentum particles $n_e = \langle \hat{N}_e \rangle/V = 8(a^3 n_c/\pi)^{1/2} n_c/3$ which is three times smaller than n_s . Combining these results, we can solve (8-11) to get closed relations between the chemical potential, the total particle density and the ground state energy:

$$\mu = \frac{4\pi a n_c}{m} \left[1 + \frac{64}{3} \left(\frac{a^3 n_c}{\pi} \right)^{1/2} \right] \quad (12)$$

$$n = n_c \left[1 + \frac{32}{3} \left(\frac{a^3 n_c}{\pi} \right)^{1/2} \right] \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{E_g}{V} = \frac{2\pi a n_c^2}{m} \left[1 + \frac{448}{15} \left(\frac{a^3 n_c}{\pi} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{2048}{9} \left(\frac{a^3 n_c}{\pi} \right) \right] \quad (14)$$

$$\cong \frac{2\pi a n^2}{m} \left[1 + \frac{128}{15} \left(\frac{a^3 n}{\pi} \right)^{1/2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{a^3 n}{\pi}\right) \right] \quad (15)$$

These are related through the thermodynamical relation $dE_g/dN = \mu$. Thus, up to the first order we recover the classical results derived in standard textbooks [6,7].

The physical interpretation of the squeezing of the condensed part is as follows [10]. Let us define the quadrature amplitudes $\hat{\mathcal{P}} = (\hat{c}_{\vec{0}} + \hat{c}_{\vec{0}}^\dagger)/2$ and $\hat{\mathcal{Q}} = (\hat{c}_{\vec{0}}^\dagger - \hat{c}_{\vec{0}})/(2i)$ of the zero mode operators. The average value of the two operators are $\langle \hat{\mathcal{P}} \rangle = \cos \theta N_c^{1/2}$ and $\langle \hat{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle = -\sin \theta N_c^{1/2}$ [15] while the quantum square fluctuations around their averages are much smaller in absolute value $\langle \delta^2 \hat{\mathcal{P}} \rangle \cong \sin^2 \theta N_s$ and $\langle \delta^2 \hat{\mathcal{Q}} \rangle \cong \cos^2 \theta N_s$ ($\delta \hat{A} = \hat{A} - \langle \hat{A} \rangle$). Representing these results on a phase space, we see that the quantum fluctuations are the largest in the angular direction and microscopic in the radial one.

Considering the potential energy part $U(\hat{c}_{\vec{0}}^\dagger, \hat{c}_{\vec{0}}) = -\mu \hat{c}_{\vec{0}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\vec{0}} + \frac{2\pi a}{mV} (\hat{c}_{\vec{0}}^\dagger \hat{c}_{\vec{0}})^2$ of the grand canonical Hamiltonian, the distribution of the quadrature amplitudes values prefers to spread out in a region where the poten-

tial energy is minimum [16]. Comparing with [9], in the HFB approach, $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is nearly a conserved quantity for $\theta = 0$ since the fluctuations of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ are microscopic and should be rather associated with a *collective motion with a microscopic restoring force*. The commutation relations $[\hat{\mathcal{Q}}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}] = i/2$ imply that the fluctuations of $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}$ are huge but finite.

The only difficulty in this new approach is that the square quantum fluctuations of the condensed part population are not normal (i.e. linear in N) but enormous: $\langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_0 \rangle = 2N_s^2 \propto N^2$. This is to be compared with the square quantum fluctuations of the excited states population which are normal [17]:

$$\langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_e \rangle = \sum_{\vec{k} \neq \vec{0}} \sinh^2(2s_{\vec{k}})/2 = 2(\pi a^3 n_c)^{1/2} N_c \propto N \quad (16)$$

On the other hand, the particle number conservation imposes that these fluctuations should be equal since the population distributions are constrained by the relation $N_0 + N_e = N$.

This apparent paradox can be easily understood if one remembers that $|\theta\rangle_g$ is not an eigenstate of the total number operator $\hat{N}$ but has enormous fluctuations dominated by $\langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_0 \rangle$. The ansatz is not $U(1)$ invariant since the phase factor θ is fixed. Thus, in the HFB approach, we do not have one ground state solution but an infinite number of degenerate ones parametrized by $\theta \in [0, 2\pi[$. A improved ground state solution is the superposition $|\phi\rangle_g = \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} f(\theta) |\theta\rangle_g$ where the function $f(\theta)$ is determined by minimizing the energy in the $|\theta\rangle_g$ subspace. In this way, we find the integral equation $\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} {}_g\langle \theta' | (\hat{H} - E_0) f(\theta) |\theta\rangle_g = 0$ with the eigenvalue E_0 which, using the properties ${}_g\langle \theta' | \theta \rangle_g = {}_g\langle 0 | \theta - \theta' \rangle_g$ and ${}_g\langle \theta' | \hat{H} | \theta \rangle_g = {}_g\langle 0 | \hat{H} | \theta - \theta' \rangle_g$, becomes a convolution equation and can be solved by making an appropriate Fourier transform. The new solution is an eigenvector of $\hat{N}$ and reads:

$$|\phi_N\rangle_g = \frac{1}{r_N} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} e^{-iN\theta} |\theta\rangle_g \quad (17)$$

where r_N is a normalisation factor.

Let us examine the property of this improved solution.

First, it lowers the ground state energy. Indeed, due to the large fluctuations, the calculations show that the term $\frac{2\pi a}{mV} \hat{N}_0^2$ contained in the Hamiltonian gives a larger contribution for $|\theta\rangle_g$ than for $|\phi_N\rangle_g$. Consequently, the new ground state energy reads:

$$\frac{E_0}{V} = \frac{E_g}{V} - \frac{4\pi a}{m} n_s^2 \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{2\pi a n_c^2}{m} \left[1 + \frac{448}{15} \left(\frac{a^3 n_c}{\pi} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{896}{9} \left(\frac{a^3 n_c}{\pi} \right) \right] \quad (19)$$

We immediately check that this shift in energy does not affect the result (15). This demonstrates that, although

in the HFB approach the symmetry is broken and the number fluctuations is enlarged, ultimately the ground state should conserve the particle number. Had we tried the more elaborated expression (17) as the ansatz, we would have obtained, after a more technical calculation, exactly the same result (18). Similarly, we can build the number conserving excited states $|\phi_N\rangle_{e,\vec{k}} \sim \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} e^{-iN\theta} |\theta\rangle_{e,\vec{k}}$ which are orthogonal to (17) and check that the excitation spectrum is unchanged.

Second, it is interesting to see how the condensed part is populated. This will illustrate what are the technicalities involved to handle with (17). To this end, we notice that $|\theta\rangle_g$ is a generating state of $|\phi_N\rangle_g$ which further can be decomposed into a product of generating states, one for the condensed part state $|N_0\rangle = (N_0!)^{-1/2} \hat{c}_0^{\dagger N_0} |0\rangle$, the other for the non-zero momentum pairs state $|N_e\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta\rangle_g &= \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} e^{iN\theta} r_N |\phi_N\rangle_g \\ &= \sum_{N_0=0}^{\infty} e^{iN_0\theta} p_{N_0} |N_0\rangle \otimes \sum_{N_e=0}^{\infty} e^{iN_e\theta} q_{N_e} |N_e\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The amplitude of the coefficients r_N , p_{N_0} and q_{N_e} can be determined through their respective generating functions:

$${}_g\langle 0 | \theta \rangle_g = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} e^{iN\theta} |r_N|^2 = G_0(\theta) G_e(\theta) \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} G_0(\theta) &= \sum_{N_0=0}^{\infty} e^{iN_0\theta} |p_{N_0}|^2 = \left[\frac{1 - \tanh^2 s_{\vec{0}}}{1 - e^{2i\theta} \tanh^2 s_{\vec{0}}} \right]^{1/2} \\ &\times \exp \left[\frac{1 - \tanh s_{\vec{0}}}{1 - e^{i\theta} \tanh s_{\vec{0}}} (e^{i\theta} - 1) N_c \right] \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} G_e(\theta) &= \sum_{N_e=0}^{\infty} e^{iN_e\theta} |q_{N_e}|^2 \\ &= \prod_{\vec{k} \neq \vec{0}} \left[\frac{1 - \tanh^2 s_{\vec{k}}}{1 - e^{2i\theta} \tanh^2 s_{\vec{k}}} \right]^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

An exact explicit expression for p_{N_0} can be calculated [10] while an approximate one for q_{N_e} is found using the saddle point method [18]. An inspection of (20) shows that the probability distribution of having N_0 condensed particles out of N in the state $|\phi_N\rangle_g$ is given by $P(N_0) = |p_{N_0} q_{N-N_0} / r_N|^2$. More explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned} P(N_0) &\cong \frac{\mathcal{N}}{N_0!} \left(-\frac{\tanh s_{\vec{0}}}{2} \right)^{N_0} H_{N_0}^2 \left(\frac{(1 - \tanh s_{\vec{0}}) N_c^{1/2}}{(-2 \tanh s_{\vec{0}})^{1/2}} \right) \\ &\times \exp \left[-\frac{(N_0 - \langle \hat{N}_0 \rangle)^2}{2 \langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_e \rangle} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $H_n(x)$ are the Hermite polynomials and $\mathcal{N}$ is a normalisation factor and $\langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_e \rangle$ is given in Eq.(16). The

population distribution is not a poissonian one but a squeezed state one [10] whose the intensity is modulated by a gaussian envelope centered in $\langle \hat{N}_0 \rangle$. The particle number fluctuations of the condensed part is given by $\langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_0 \rangle_N = {}_g \langle \phi_N | \delta^2 \hat{N}_0 | \phi_N \rangle_g = \langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_e \rangle_N$. Again using the saddle point method, we calculate [18]:

$$\langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_0 \rangle_N = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha^2} \ln \left[\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta e^{-iN\theta} G_0(\theta) G_e(\theta + i\alpha) \right]_{\alpha=0} \quad (25)$$

$$\cong \langle \delta^2 \hat{N}_e \rangle = 2(\pi a^3 n_c)^{1/2} N_c \quad (26)$$

showing that the fluctuations are indeed normal. This result is identical to that derived previously by Giorgini et al. [17] by considering the condensed part as a particle reservoir.

In conclusion, we have constructed a ground state which is stationary in the HFB approach. The key ingredient is the macroscopic squeezing of the condensed part. This squeezing implies prohibitively large particle number fluctuations which are suppressed if we build the appropriate $U(1)$ invariant number conserving superposition of the squeezed states.

An important issue is to know how the macroscopic squeezing is modified at non zero temperature and how it changes the critical temperature [19] as well as other quantities of experimental interest [20]. This issue can be addressed by means of a variational approach [5,21] in the same way as for fermions in the theory of superconductivity [22]. Other topics include: the investigation of the validity of the non-perturbative mean field result (18) according to the coupling parameter na^3 [19] and an analyse of the quantum phase diffusion, in particular, an improved calculation of the two-time correlation function $\langle \hat{\psi}^\dagger(\vec{r}, t) \hat{\psi}(\vec{r}, 0) \rangle_N$ [9,23]. These further developments would allow to find a test for the experimental evidence of the macroscopic squeezing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS P.N. has been supported by the TMR Network "Coherent Matter Wave Interactions", contract ERBFMRX CT96-0002 and by the Republic of Greece State Scholarship Foundation, contract No 384. P.N. wants to acknowledge constructive criticism by Professor M. Wilkens and to thank Professor A. Theophilou and Dr. C. Henkel for enlightening discussions.

[1] M.H. Anderson, J.H. Ensher, M.R. Matthews, C.E. Wieman and E.A. Cornell, *Science* **269**, 198 (1995); C.C. Bradley, C.A. Sacket, J.J. Tollet and R.H. Hulet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 1687 (1995); K.B. Davies, M.-O. Mewes, M.R. Andrews, N.J. van Druten, D.S. Durfee, D.M. Kurn and W. Ketterle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3969 (1995).

[2] P.C. Hohenberg and P.C. Martin, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **34**, 291 (1965); M. Girardeau and R. Arnowitt, *Phys. Rev.* **113**, 755 (1959). The HFB approximation is often called the Girardeau-Arnouitt approximation in the literature.

[3] A. Griffin, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 9341 (1996).

[4] N.P. Proukakis, K. Burnett and H.T.C. Stoof, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1230 (1998).

[5] D.A. Huse and E.D. Siggia, *J. Low Temp. Phys.* **46**, 137 (1982).

[6] K. Huang, *Statistical Mechanics* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1987).

[7] A.L. Fetter and J.D. Walecka, *Quantum Theory of Many Particle Systems* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1971).

[8] V.N. Popov, *Functional Integrals and Collective Modes* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).

[9] M. Lewenstein and L. You, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 3489 (1996).

[10] D.F. Walls and G.J. Milburn, *Quantum Optics* (Springer Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1994); L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).

[11] C.W. Gardiner, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 1414 (1997); see also R. Dum and Y. Castin (unpublished).

[12] The second term in the parentheses of (11) comes from $(\partial/\partial r)r$ and compensates the ultraviolet divergence arising in $\sinh(2s_{\vec{k}})$.

[13] The squeezing of the condensed phase has already been introduced in the literature in a different context. See for example D. Blaschke, H.-P. Pavel, V.N. Pervushin, G. Röpke and M.K. Volkov, *Phys. Lett. B* **397**, 129 (1997).

[14] One already encounter such a singularity in the ideal Bose gas where the macroscopic population for the condensate given by the Bose-Einstein factor $N_0 = (\exp(\beta\mu) - 1)^{-1}$ comes from a chemical potential μ close to zero [6].

[15] The mean values of the quadrature amplitudes correspond to the real and imaginary components of the order parameter $\langle \hat{\psi}_0 \rangle$ [6].

[16] P. Villain, M. Lewenstein, R. Dum, Y. Castin, L. You, A. Imamoglu and T.A.B. Kennedy, *J. Mod. Opt.* **44**, 1775 (1997).

[17] S. Giorgini, L.P. Pitaveskii and S. Stringari (unpublished).

[18] P. Navez, D. Bitouk, M. Gajda, Z. Idziaszek and K. Rzążewski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 1789 (1997); M. Gajda and K. Rzążewski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2686 (1997); C. Weiss and M. Wilkens, *Optics Express* **1**, 272 (1997).

[19] P. Grüter, D. Ceperley and F. Laloë (unpublished).

[20] D.A.W. Hutchison, E. Zaremba and A. Griffin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1842 (1997); R.J. Dodd, M. Edwards, C.W. Clark and K. Burnett, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 32 (1998).

[21] M. Bijlsma and H.T.C. Stoof, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 498 (1997).

[22] P.G. de Gennes, *Superconductivity of Metal and Alloys* (W.A. Benjamin, New York, 1966).

[23] J. Javanainen and M. Wilkens, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 4675 (1997).